Approved For Release 2005/04/12: CIA-RDP75-00662R000100050044-1

6 a

Attached is the analysis, which you requested in your memorandum of November 16, of the agreements concluded between the USER and countries of Eastern Europe.

The Seviet Union has concluded two types of agreements with the Eastern European countries, trade agreements and agreements for secnomic collaboration. On the basis of this study the following ensuers can be made to the specific question which you saked.

There is a general pattern which is evident in the conclusion of these agreements. It is that the USER is establishing an economic besis for close political and economic relations with all Eastern European countries of the conclusion of short-term bilateral trade agreements. By the conclusion of short-term bilateral trade agreements. The USER is receiving from these countries raw materials, food, and some semi-finished products such as cotton texfood, and some semi-finished products such as cotton textiles in return for a variety of goods and materials. Unfortunately, we do not possess sufficient information to make any conclusions regarding the terms of trade or the rate of actual deliveries.

By means of the agreements for aconomic collaboration the USER is apparently endeavering to obtain a predominant position in various sectors of the economics of the ex-enemy states by the formation of joint holding companies stipulated in the agreements. Soviet investment in these companies generally consists of capital goods and equipment claimed by the foviet Union as reparations and was booty, but denated as its chare of fifty percent of the stock of the joint companies.

Because of the paucity of statistical information concerning the trade agreements, prices and deliveries, it is difficult to determine whether or not the trade agreements are in fact extertionate. The reparations, agreements are in fact extertionate. The reparations, of course, give the UNSA a transmission advantage and are preving to be a heavy strain on the economies of those countries obligated to pay reparations.

Compared

Compared with pre-war trade between the USAR and the countries of Eastern Surope, the trade agreements are diverting trade into unnatural bilateral channels. For example, the USAR during 1934, 1936, and 1938 did not receive more than three percent of the exports or provide more than three percent of the imports of Eumania, Bulgaria, Bungary, Tugošlavia, Czechoslovakia, and Poland; however, at the present time the Soviet Union is taking more than ninety percent of the available experts of most of these countries and is furnishing practically all of the imports. Concerning the question of the natural bilateral channels it should be pointed out that Germany prior to the war was the primary market and source of imports for most of the countries of Eastern Surope. With Germany removed as a market and source of imports, a substantial change in the foreign trade of the countries of Eastern Surope is inevitable.

At the present time finence, communications, and trade in Surope is disrupted, and no normal trade pattern has been established. It is doubtful that the countries of Eastern Europe could have established trade on a basis approaching the pre-way volume with other countries of Europe even without the presence of economic and political pressure from the USSE.

25X1